

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-3, 6, 11, 13, 26, 28-29, 32 and 35 have been amended. Claims 5, 7-10 and 14-25 have previously been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6, 11-13 and 25-35 now are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by Szeliski, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,600,491 (“Szeliski”).

Applicant respectfully submits that Szeliski discloses “[a] system . . . for generating a video animation from the frames of a video sprite with user-controlled motion is presented.” (Abstract). Szeliski further discloses that the system includes a “probability distribution [that] is employed to *identify the potentially acceptable transitions between frames of the input video clip*. Prior to actually selecting the order of the frames of the input video that are to be played in a synthesizing process, the number of potentially acceptable transitions that there are to choose from can be pruned to eliminate those that are less desirable and to reduce the processing workload.” (col. 4, lines 61-66; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites “detecting transition points in the video stream; [and] automatically generating segment annotations in the video stream at the detected transition points.” (emphasis provided). Applicant respectfully submits that Szeliski does not teach or reasonably suggest such a feature. Szeliski discloses identifying the potentially acceptable transitions between frames of the input video clip (col. 4, lines 61-62); however, Szeliski fails to teach or reasonably suggest “detecting transition points in the video stream;

[and] automatically generating segment annotations in the video stream at the detected transition points” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependant claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 4, 6, 11-13, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Wilcox et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,072,542 (“Wilcox”) in view of Szeliski, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,600,491 (“Szeliski”).

Wilcox discloses “[d]etection of video shot boundaries using a Video Segmenting Hidden Markov Model to model the sequence of states of a video. The Video Segmenting Hidden Markov Model determines the state sequence based on feature values.” (Abstract). Nonetheless, Wilcox fails to teach or reasonably suggest “detecting transition points in the first and second shots; [and] based on the transition points, automatically determining a duration of a transition sequence based on probability distribution” as recited by claim 11. (emphasis provided).

As discussed above, Szeliski does not teach or reasonably suggest “detecting transition points in the first and second shots; [and] based on the transition points, automatically determining a duration of a transition sequence based on probability distribution” as recited by claim 11. (emphasis provided). Since neither Szeliski nor Wilcox teach or reasonably suggest detecting transition points in the first and second shots, and based on the transition points, automatically determining a duration of a transition sequence based on probability distribution, any combination of Szeliski and Wilcox would not teach or reasonably suggest the feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 11 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claims 26 and 32 include limitations similar to those of claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 26 and 32 and their dependent claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 11-22-05


Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980